

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

A petition for a one month extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action of June 2, 2004 is hereby made.

Claims 1-50 are pending in this application. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 8, 15, 19, 27 – 30 and 47 – 50 will be amended, and new dependent claims 51 – 78 will be added. Submitted with this Amendment is an Information Disclosure Statement including patents and publications for consideration by the Examiner in connection with the examination of the present application.

In the outstanding Office Action of June 2, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, arguing that the terms "low resolution" and "high resolution" in the independent claims are relative terms which render the claims indefinite. The Examiner further argued that "the terms are not defined by the claims and that the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree [sic] The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

Contrary to the Examiner's argument, the application specification does teach how to generate a low resolution scan file, as recited in the independent claims of the present application. The generation of a low resolution scan file is

discussed in the "Summary Of The Invention" section of the specification of the present application, and, in particular, at pages 6-7 of the specification.

According to that description, an Internet user/catalog customer seeking to browse a catalog is first provided with a low resolution image file of a requested catalog page. As explained at page 7 of the specification, nominally, this low resolution file would be 20-30 kilobytes ("KB") in size, it having been generated using a reduction computation based on a reduction ratio of nominally 20 MB to 20 KB. The specification goes on to explain that the size of the computer file corresponding to each of the low resolution image pages is reduced to be as small as possible, while still allowing sufficient detail to allow a customer to recognize generally at least the products imaged on the page and also headline and/or category name text on the page.

The higher resolution image of a product is part of the more detailed presentation, and is discussed at page 8 of the application specification. There, the application specification explains that the more detailed presentation may be built from several files which include the higher resolution image of a selected product. The higher resolution image of the product is described as one that is a larger file size [than that used for generating the product image as part of the low resolution scan file].

It should also be noted that the terms "low resolution" and "high resolution" are not merely relative terms, such that they render the claims indefinite, as argued by the Examiner in his §112 rejection. Rather, these are defined terms, as evidenced by the copy of the relevant pages of the third edition of *Que's Computer User's Dictionary*, published in 1992, and attached to this Amendment as Attachment A. At page 364 of this dictionary, the term "low resolution" is defined as such:

In computer monitors and printers, a visual definition that isn't sufficient to produce well-defined characters or smoothly defined curves in graphic images, resulting in characters and graphics with jagged edges.

Similarly, at page 298 of this dictionary, the term "high resolution" is defined as such:

In computer monitors and printers, a visual definition that is sufficient to produce well-defined characters, even at large type sizes, as well as smoothly defined curves in graphic images.

Clearly, these definitions provide further evidence that the terms "low resolution scan" and "high resolution image" recited in the claims of the present application are not indefinite. The example of the low resolution scan shown in Figure 5 of the present application does not include well-defined characters or smoothly defined curves in its graphic images, while the example of the high

resolution product image 42A shown in Figure 6 includes more smoothly-defined curves.

The foregoing definitions also correspond with the present invention, as described in the independent claims pending in this application. Independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19 and 47-50 have been amended to clarify that each of the catalog pages contains at least one image and text for identifying and purchasing products presented on the catalog page, that the low resolution scan displays the image and text in the format of a printed catalog page and being generated using a reduction ratio, that the low resolution scan file is reduced to a size that is as small as possible, while still providing a display with sufficient detail to allow a customer to recognize generally at least products imaged on the catalog page. A number of dependent claims have been added which also recite that the low resolution scan file provides a display with sufficient detail to allow a customer to also recognize headline and/or category name text for the imaged products on the page. Support for the amendments appears at least at pages 6 to 7 and Figure 5 of the application specification and drawings. In view of these claim amendments and the explanation of the terms "low resolution scan" and "high resolution image" in the present application discussed above, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-50 based on the recitation of the terms "low resolution" and "high resolution" in the independent claims should be withdrawn.

In his rejection under §112, second paragraph, the Examiner also notes that claims 27-30 include the limitation "wherein each product displayed on said low resolution scan is a hyperlink." Given the amendments to claims 27-30 to clarify that each product image displayed on said low resolution scan is a hyperlink for linking to the detailed presentation for said product, the Examiner's rejection of claims 27-30 under §112 should also be withdrawn.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-50 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by the website www.bartswatersports.com (hereinafter "Barts"). In his rejection, the Examiner references the October 1, 2000 version of the Barts website in the PTO-892 Form mailed with the outstanding Office Action. The Examiner's §102(b) rejection is also respectfully traversed.

For a claim to be anticipated by a reference, each and every element recited in the claim must be present in the cited reference. As noted above, independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19 and 47-50 have been amended to clarify (1) that each of the catalog pages contains at least one image and text for identifying and purchasing products presented on the catalog page, (2) that the low resolution scan displays the image and text in the format of a printed catalog page and is generated using a reduction ratio, and (3) that the low resolution scan file is reduced to a size that is

as small as possible, while still providing a display with sufficient detail to allow a customer to recognize generally at least products imaged on the catalog page. In addition, a number of dependent claims have been added which also recite that the low resolution scan file provides a display with sufficient detail to allow a customer to also recognize headline and/or category name text for the imaged products on the page. As explained at page 7 of the application specification, in the embodiment of the invention disclosed in the application the product identification information includes a category name for the products, such as the category name example, "Drill Bits & Accessories", shown in the upper right-hand corner of the catalog page 33 depicted in Figure 5 of the present application, and a headline for each product to more specifically identify the product and its benefits, such as the headline example, "Screw Tip Auger Bit Set For Straight, Deep Holes In Tough Materials", shown in the lower right-hand part of catalog page 33 depicted in Figure 5 and as item 43A in Figure 6 of the present application.

The Barts webpage cited by the Examiner does not anticipate claims 1-50 of the present application because Barts does not disclose specific catalogs or catalog pages or the use of low resolution scans files of the catalog pages, much less the use of a low resolution scan file that displays product images and text for identifying and purchasing products in the format of a printed catalog page, and that is generated using a reduction ratio so as to be reduced to a size that is as small

as possible, while still providing a display with sufficient detail to allow a customer to recognize generally at least products imaged on a corresponding catalog page and also headline and/or category name text for the imaged products, as recited in the claims of the present application. Rather, the Barts website provides only listings of product categories which are hyperlinks that, when clicked by a user, lead to the generation of collections of product images that are not presented in the format of printed catalog pages which include product images and product description and purchasing information. Accordingly, Barts does not anticipate independent claims 1, 8, 15, 19 and 47-50 pending in the application. As such, it also does not anticipate dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-18, and 20-46, which depend either directly or indirectly from such independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims pending in the application, *i.e.*, originally-pending claims 1 – 50 and newly-added dependent claims 51-78 , are now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly

WIRTH
Serial No. 10/004,107

solicited. If any issues remain in this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: Robert A. Molan
Robert A. Molan
Reg. No. 29,834

RAM:drt
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor
Arlington, VA 22201-4714
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100